



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/593,227

09/18/2006

Elizabeth Harumi Kobara Pestell

HF/15-23033/A/PCT

7040

324 7590 06/06/2008

JoAnn Villamizar  
Ciba Corporation/Patent Department  
540 White Plains Road  
P.O. Box 2005  
Tarrytown, NY 10591

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, THUY-AI N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/06/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/593,227	KOBARA PESTELL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	THUY-AI N. NGUYEN	1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/19/2007</u> .  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 3 is objected because this composition does not further limit the process of claim 1. Therefore, it should not have dependency on claim 1.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1- 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ghosh et al. (US. 6,090,399).

Regarding claims 1 and 2, Ghosh et al teach the method of treating fabric and textile (col. 12: 35-60) with the composition comprising antimicrobial agent including 2-(4'-thiazolyl) benzimidazole (col. 5: 40- 45) which satisfy the formula as recited by the applicant when R<sub>1</sub> is hydrogen.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 1796

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3- 7, and 9- 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghosh et al. (US. 2004/0261196).

Regarding claims 3-4, and 6-7, Ghosh et al teach the method of treating fabric [0119] with the cleaning composition comprising antimicrobial agent including 2-(4'-thiazolyl)benzimidazole [0101] which satisfy the formula as recited by the applicant when R<sub>1</sub> is hydrogen. Ghosh et al. teach the composition comprising from about 0.01 to 20 percent of antimicrobial organism [0100], including 2-(4'-thiazolyl)benzimidazole [0101], 1 to 99 percent by weight of surfactants including anionic, nonionic, cationic, and zwitterionic [0095] which is detergent. Ghosh et al. further teach the composition comprising builder, bleach, bleach activator, alcohol, hydrotropes, fabric softening agent [0118], and water in an amount of from 1 to 90 percent by weight of the composition [0112].

Ghosh et al. do not specifically teach the amount of builder, bleach, bleach activator, alcohol, hydrotropes, fabric softening agent. The experimental modification of this prior art in order to ascertain optimum operating conditions fails to render applicants' claims patentable in the absence of unexpected results. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to optimize the amount of builder, bleach, bleach activator, alcohol, hydrotropes, fabric softening agent to achieve the desired performance of the cleaning composition. A prima facie case of obviousness may be rebutted, however,

Art Unit: 1796

where the results of the optimizing variable, which is known to be result-effective, are unexpectedly good. *In re Boesch and Slaney*, 205 USPQ 215.

Regarding claim 5, Ghosh et al. teach the composition comprising sulfonated oleic acid [0101] which is capable of using as component (b).

Regarding claims 9- 10, Ghosh et al. teach the composition comprising an antimicrobial agent 2,4,4'- trichloro- 2' hydroxyl diphenyl ether [0102], which satisfies the formula as recited by the applicant when  $p=0$ ,  $n=0$ , and  $o=1$ ,  $m=1$ , and  $r=2$ .

Regarding claim 11, Ghosh et al. teach the composition comprising from about 0.01 to 20 percent of antimicrobial organism [0100], including 2-(4'-thiazolyl)benzimidazole [0101] and 2-hydroxy-diphenyl ether [0102] as described above, 1 to 99 percent by weight of surfactants including anionic, nonionic, cationic, and zwitterionic [0095] which is detergent. Ghosh et al. further teach the composition comprising alcohol, hydrotropes [0118], and water in an amount of from 1 to 90 percent by weight of the composition [0112].

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghosh et al. (US. 2004/0261196) as applied to claims 3 above in view of Majeti et al. (US. 2003/0212232).

Regarding claim 8, Ghosh et al. teach the method for treating textile, wherein the composition comprises enzyme. However, Ghosh et al. do not specifically teach that the enzyme is cellulose, protease, amylase, and lipase. Majeti et al. teach the composition for treating textile and hard surface, wherein the composition comprises the

Art Unit: 1796

enzyme including protease, amylase, and lipase [0181]. Majeti et al. and Ghosh et al. are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor, namely, home care composition for textile or fabric and other surface, wherein both composition comprises antimicrobial agent 2',4,4'-trichloro-2-hydroxy-diphenyl-ether. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use protease, amylase, and lipase of Majeti et al. in the teaching of Ghosh et al. as an alternative equivalent in order to help break down the stain on the surface being treated.

Claims 12- 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Majeti et al. (US. 2003/0212232) in view of Ghosh et al. (US. 2004/0261196).

Regarding claim 12, Majeti et al. teach the method for washing and fungicidal treatment of textile fibre material [0031] comprising the step of applying or contacting the composition with the surface to be treated [0189], wherein the composition comprising the antimicrobial agent 2-hydroxy diphenyl ether (2',4,4'-trichloro-2-hydroxy-diphenyl-ether [0091].

Majeti et al. do not teach the composition comprising the compound of formula I as recited in claim 1. Ghosh et al. teach the composition comprising antimicrobial agents including 2-(4'-thiazolyl)benzimidazole [0101], and 2,4,4'- trichloro- 2' hydroxyl diphenyl ether [0102]. Majeti et al. and Ghosh et al. are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor, namely, home care composition for textile or fabric and other surface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute 2-(4'-thiazolyl)benzimidazole of Ghosh et al. as an

Art Unit: 1796

equivalent alternative in the teaching of Majeti et al. for 2,4,4'- trichloro- 2' hydroxyl diphenyl ether for the same purpose of using hydroxy-diphenyl-ether.

Regarding claim 13, Majeti et al. teach the method, wherein the composition comprising enzyme including protease, amylase, and lipase [0181], wherein the solution in the process is carried out the room temperature [0227].

Regarding claim 14, Majeti et al. teach the method for washing and treating textile, wherein the textile is cotton [0201].

Regarding claim 15, Majeti et al. teach the process, wherein the composition can be in solid [0160], or in liquid formulation [0165].

Regarding claim 16, Majeti et al. teach the process of fungicidal treatment on the hard surface (abstract), wherein the composition further comprising 0.01 to 20 percent of antimicrobial agent [0183], 5 to 70 percent of surfactants [0181], 5- 50 percent of builder [0181], 0.5 to 10 percent of fabric softening agent [0181], and water up to 100 percent by weight (example 16, see the table, p. 16).

Majeti et al. do not teach the composition comprising the compound of formula I as recited in claim 1. Ghosh et al. teach the composition comprising antimicrobial agents including 2-(4'-thiazolyl)benzimidazole [0101], and 2,4,4'- trichloro- 2' hydroxyl diphenyl ether [0102]. Majeti et al. and Ghosh et al. are analogous art because they are in the same field of endeavor, namely, home care composition for textile or fabric and other surface. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to substitute 2-(4'-thiazolyl)benzimidazole of Ghosh et al. as an

Art Unit: 1796

equivalent alternative in the teaching of Majeti et al. for 2,4,4'- trichloro- 2' hydroxyl diphenyl ether for the same purpose of using hydroxy-diphenyl-ether.

Regarding claim 17, Majeti et al. teach the process, wherein the composition is used as dishwashing formulation [0151- 0154].

Regarding claim 18, Majeti et al. teach the process, wherein the composition is used for cleaning ceramic surfaces including floor, tiles, bath, sink [0135], toilet bowl [0140], shower walls [0144], glass- ceramic plates [0148], dishes [0151], and laundry [0181].

### ***Correspondence***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THUY-AI N. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)270-3294. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday: 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m. eastern time.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Eashoo can be reached on 571-272-1197. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

May 30, 2008

Patent Examiner  
Thuy- Ai N. Nguyen

/David Wu/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796